<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Before entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 were pending. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 5, 8-11, 14-17 and 19 are amended, and claims 21-25 are added. After entry of the amendment, claims 1-25 are pending.

I. <u>Claims 1-11 and 13-20</u>

Claims 1-11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (US Pat. Application 2004/0070491 A1) (Office Action, p. 2, lines 12-13).

A. <u>Independent claim 1</u>

Huang does not form the basis for a valid rejection of claim 1 under § 102(e) because Huang does not disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Claim 1 as amended recites, "receiving a programming signal onto an RFID reader in a remote control device, wherein the programming signal <u>conveys a complete codeset</u>" (emphasis added).

The Examiner states, with regard to claim 1, that "Huang discloses the claimed method of receiving a programming signal onto an RFID reader in a remote control device, wherein the programming signal conveys codeset data, which is met by a universal remote control 10 is provided with appliance activated setup ("DAS") capability . . ." (Office Action, p. 2, lines 14-17).

Although Huang discloses "RFID tag data" transferred to a universal remote control, "RFID tag data" does not include a complete code set. Huang states that "RFID tag data" may include FCD data as well as DAS data. (Huang, ¶ 0075). Neither FCD data nor DAS data, however, includes a codeset. Huang explains that data for commanding functions of an appliance is different from FCD data, DAS data and RFID data:

"In some instances, it will be appreciated that it may not be necessary that the data for commanding functions of an appliance, for use in displaying soft keys, or for otherwise setting up the universal remote control 10 be locally stored on the universal remote control 10. Rather, the universal remote control 10 may be adapted to use DAS data, RFID data, FCD data, or the like to obtain such data from a remote data repository. . . . [P]rovided that the minimum data required to identify a device type and model, command function, etc. can be obtained via DAS, RFID, direct user input, or the like, the remote control 10 may use the personal computer as a intermediate client to access a remote data repository and obtain from the remote data repository capability and configuration data necessary to setup the universal remote control 10 to control an appliance." (Huang, ¶ 0080) (emphasis added).

In Huang, codesets are either stored locally on the universal remote control or are located in a command code library stored in a centralized device database. Huang also explains:

"[I]t will also be appreciated that the universal remote control 10 need not have a locally stored library of command codes that are accessed to setup the universal remote control 10 in response to receipt of either DAS and/or FCD data (for example, received from an RFID tag). . . . Rather, the universal remote control 10 may be adapted to use received DAS and/or FCD data to downloaded [sic] needed command codes and/or icons from a data repository remote from the universal remote control 10, as generally illustrated in the flowchart of FIG. 13 and described in more detail hereinafter. (Huang, ¶ 0076) (emphasis added).

DAS data, FCD data, and RFID data does not include command codes. Thus, Huang does not disclose an RFID reader in a remote control device that receives a complete codeset.

Because Huang does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1, reconsideration of the § 102(e) rejection and allowance of claim 1 are requested.

B. Dependent claims 2-10

Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang. Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Dependent

claims 2-10 are allowable for at least the same reasons for which claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-10 are requested.

C. Independent claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang. Claim 11 as amended recites, "wherein the RFID reader module receives a programming signal from the coupling element, wherein the programming signal conveys a complete codeset". Huang does not form the basis for a valid rejection of claim 11 under § 102(e) because Huang does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 11.

With regard to claim 11, as with regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Huang discloses "a programming signal [received] onto an RFID reader in a remote control device, wherein the programming signal conveys codeset data, which is met by a universal remote control 10 is provided with appliance activated setup ("DAS") capability . . ." (Office Action, p. 2, lines 14-17).

None of the FCD data, the DAS data or the RFID data disclosed in Huang includes a complete codeset. The data for commanding functions of an appliance is different from the FCD data, DAS data and RFID data disclosed in Huang. Thus, Huang does not disclose an RFID reader module that receives a programming signal that conveys a complete codeset.

Because Huang does not disclose all of the elements of claim 11, reconsideration of the § 102(e) rejection and allowance of claim 11 are requested.

D. Dependent claims 13-18

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang. Claims 13-18 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11. Dependent claims 13-18 are allowable for at least the same reasons for which claim 11 is allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 13-18 are requested.

E. Independent claim 19

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang. Claim 19 as amended recites, "means for receiving a programming signal using inductive coupling and absorption modulation, wherein the programming signal contains a complete codeset, and wherein the complete codeset includes the codeset key data" (emphasis added). Huang does not form the basis for a valid rejection of claim 19 under § 102(e) because Huang does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 19.

With regard to claim 19, as with regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Huang discloses that "the programming signal conveys codeset data, which is met by a universal remote control 10 is provided with appliance activated setup ("DAS") capability . . ." (Office Action, p. 2, lines 14-17). None of the FCD data, the DAS data or the RFID data disclosed in Huang includes a complete codeset. The data for commanding functions of an appliance is different from the FCD data, DAS data and RFID data disclosed in Huang. Thus, Huang does not disclose a means for receiving a programming signal that contains a complete codeset.

Because Huang does not disclose all of the elements of claim 19, reconsideration of the § 102(e) rejection and allowance of claim 19 are requested.

F. Dependent claim 20

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang. Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is allowable for at least the same reasons for which claim 19 is allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 20 is requested.

II. Claim 12

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Collins et al. (US Patent No. 6,392,544) (Office Action, p. 4,

Applicant: Oscar C. Miramontes
Serial No.: 10/814,708
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
Docket No.: ZIL-574

lines 1-2). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must demonstrate that the references when combined teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. Huang and Collins do not form the basis of a valid rejection of claim 12 under § 103(a) because these references when combined do not teach or suggest a programming signal that conveys a complete codeset.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is allowable for at least the same reasons for which claim 11 is allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 12 is requested.

III. New claims 21-25

Applicant is adding new claims 21-25, each of which is supported by the specification and allowable over the cited references.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application (claims 1-25 are pending) is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner would like to discuss any aspect of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (925) 621-2121.

<table>
<tr><td>

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By _[signature]_
Darien K. Wallace

Date of Deposit: December 3, 2005

</td><td>

Respectfully submitted,

[signature]

Darien K. Wallace
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 53,736
Customer No. 47,713

</td></tr>
</table>